

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

AIR VENT, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

POWERMAX ELECTRIC CO., LTD.,
GUANDONG,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. 3:24-CV-2852-X

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF
PERSONAL JURISDICTION**

Pending before the Court is Defendant Powermax Electrical Co., Ltd., Guandong’s (Powermax) motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. (Doc. 7). After reviewing the motion, response, and applicable law, the Court **DENIES** Powermax’s motion. (Doc. 7).

I. Background


This is one of many Air Vent cases in front of this Court: No. 3:22-CV-0229; No. 3:22-CV-2437, consolidated with No. 3:22-CV-2793, No. 3:22-CV-2439, and No. 3:23-CV-0722; No. 3:23-cv-1476; No. 3:24-cv-1230; No. 3:24-cv-2047; and No. 3:25-cv-0531. In each of these cases in which Powermax has appeared, Powermax has filed a motion to dismiss plaintiff Air Vent Inc.’s complaint for lack of personal jurisdiction. The Court has authored a memorandum opinion and order analyzing the merits of—and ultimately denying—Powermax’s motion in *Air Vent Inc. v. Powermax Electric Co. LTD*, No. 3:22-CV-0229, (Doc. 93) (N.D. Tex.) (Starr. J.).

The facts in this case differ slightly, but none of those differences warrant deviating from the Court's decision in No. 3:22-CV-0229. While this case concerns a different fire occurring in a different state, Air Vent has produced documents in jurisdictional discovery showing that Powermax entered a long-standing relationship knowing that its fans were being shipped to Texas and that the fan in question in this dispute passed through Texas. So while the facts are slightly different, the Court's analysis in No. 3:22-CV-0229 remains unchanged.

II. Conclusion

Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Powermax's motion. (Doc. 7).

IT IS SO ORDERED this 21st day of March, 2025.



BRANTLEY STARR
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE